

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS Washington, D.C. 20231

SERIAL NUMBER FIRST NAMED INVENTOR ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. FILING DATE \cap NILSSEN 02/07/92 07/831,086 EXAMINER MIS.D OLE K. NILSSEN CAESAR DRIVE ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER 60010 BARRINGTON, IL 2502 DATE MAILED: This is a communication from the examiner in charge of your application. COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS days from the date of this letter. A shortened statutory period for response to this action is set to expire. month(s). Failure to respond within the period for response will cause the application to become abandoned. 35 U.S.C. 133 THE FOLLOWING ATTACHMENT(S) ARE PART OF THIS ACTION: 1. Notice of References Cited by Examiner, PTO-892. 2. D Notice re Patent Drawing, PTO-948. 4. Notice of informal Patent Application, Form PTO-152. ☐ Notice of Art Cited by Applicant, PTO-1449. 5. Information on How to Effect Drawing Changes, PTO-1474. **SUMMARY OF ACTION** 1. Claims 1-7, and 19-24 2. X Claims 8-18 4. X Claims ______ 5. Claims are objected to. 6. Claims_ are subject to restriction or election requirement. 7. This application has been filed with informal drawings under 37 C.F.R. 1.85 which are acceptable for examination purposes. 8. \square Formal drawings are required in response to this Office action. 9.

The corrected or substitute drawings have been received on ____ . Under 37 C.F.R. 1.84 these drawings are \square acceptable. \square not acceptable (see explanation or Notice re Patent Drawing, PTO-948). 10. 🔲 The proposed additional or substitute sheet(s) of drawings, filed on _______ has (have) been 🔲 approved by the examiner.

disapproved by the examiner (see explanation). _____, has been approved. disapproved (see explanation). 11. The proposed drawing correction, filed on ____ 12. Acknowledgment is made of the claim for priority under U.S.C. 119. The certified copy has 🔲 been received 🔲 not been received been filed in parent application, serial no. __ : filed on _ 13. 🔲 Since this application appears to be in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.

EXAMINER'S ACTION

Serial No. 831,086

Art Unit 2502

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. § 103 which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Subject matter developed by another person, which qualifies as prior art only under subsection (f) or (g) of section 102 of this title, shall not preclude patentability under this section where the subject matter and the claimed invention were, at the time the invention was made, owned by the same person or subject to an obligation of assignment to the same person.

Claims 1-7 and 19-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Spira et al in view of Galindo and further in view of Elms.

Galindo taught that an electrical distribution system could consist of track means. Spira et al taught that an electrical distribution system can be supplied with a high frequency. So, track means can be supplied with a high frequency. Elms teaches a high frequency supply providing electrical conduction therethrough. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to incorporate the teachings of Elms with those of Galindo and Spira thereby providing the claimed invention.

Serial No. 831,086

Art Unit 2502

Applicant has not complied with one or more conditions for receiving the benefit of an earlier filing date under 35 U.S.C. § 120 as follows:

The continuing application must contain a specific reference to the parent application(s) in the specification.

The recent parent applications are not referenced in the specification.

The information disclosure statement filed February 7, 1992 fails to comply with the provisions of MPEP 609 because explanations and copies are not provided (see MPEP 609). It has been placed in the application file, but the information referred to therein has not been considered as to the merits.

Any inquiry concerning this communication should be directed to Examiner Mis at telephone number (703) 308-4907.

Mis/EW March 31, 1992 DAVID MIS EXAMINER GROUP ART UNIT 252

4